DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 818 IR 000 963

TITLE	Dissemination and In-service Training: Report of the Schools Council Dissemination Working Party (1972-73). Pamphlet No. 14.
INSTITUTION	Schools Council, London (England).
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	40p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Schools Council, Central Despatch Section, 160 Great Portland Street, London W1M 6LL (Free while supplies last)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Curriculum Development; Curriculum Research; *Information Dissemination; *Inservice Teacher Education; Program Descriptions; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Great Britain

ABSTRACT

A working party of the Schools Council--a central agency funding national curriculum development projects in Great Britain--developed general principles and recommendations for the dissemination of these curriculum projects. The main aspects of dissemination are strategy, teacher involvement, local support, inservice training, use of media, and evaluation. Some of the recommendations were to facilitate the flow of information between users and projects, to support information services and publications, to develop training programs for the projects, to provide after-care support for projects, to aid project directors in dissemination activities, and to fund research and evaluation on dissemination success. (WH)

SC pamphlet 14

DISSEMINATION AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING

report of the Schools Council Dissemination Working Party (1972-73)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IR 000 963

SCHOOLS COUNCIL
160 Great Portland Street
London W1N 6LL

1974

Still available in this series of pamphlets

8. Co-operation between the Youth Service and Schools (1971)

9. Race Relations and the Curriculum: a Short Analysis and Summary of the Work initiated by the Schools Council (1972)

10. Short-stay Residential Experience: Residential Work by Secondary School Pupils (1972)

11. Social Sciences and the Sixth Form - an Approach through Integration (1973)

12. Review of Comments on Examinations Bulletin 23 A Common System of Examining at 16+ (1973)

13. The Fourth and Fifth Years: Patterns of Organization in Two Secondary Schools (1974)

Copies of pamphlets in this series are available free, while supplies last, on application to the Central Despatch Section, Schools Council, 160 Great Portland Street, London W1N 6LL.

CONTENTS

	Foreword	page 5
	Introduction	7
I	PRINCIPLES OF DISSEMINATION POLICY	
	1. The setting	9
	2. Successful dissemination	10
	3. Outline of dissemination strategy	11
	4. Dissemination as information	14
	5. Area information centres	15
	6. Dissemination through involvement	16
	7. Training materials	17
	8. Dissemination through after-care	19
	9. Local support for innovation	21
	10. Future developments in initial and in-service training	23
	11. Press, radio, television and the Open University	24
	12. Evaluation of dissemination	25
	13. General considerations for the Council	27
	14. Conclusions	28
	Notes	30
II	RECOMMENDATIONS	
	Network	33
	Information services	33
	Training	34
	Project operation	35
	After-care	36
	Research and evaluation	37
	General	37
Appendix:	Membership of the working party and list of visitors	39

Foreword

The Council's Programme Committee, at its Bournemouth Conference in October 1973, approved the principles of dissemination policy outlined in this report and accorded them a high priority in the Council's programme of work.

The Committee accepted the majority of the working party's recommendations. While rejecting the suggestion that teacher consultants should be appointed (Recommendation 27), it recommended that after-care should be sustained through a variety of institutions which already support the work of projects and which might use the expertise of teachers where this was available. Programme Committee also decided that the question of Schools Council Research Fellowships (Recommendation 33) should be deferred until a later date and that the possible introduction of such fellowships should not necessarily be tied to dissemination.

At the Programme Committee's meeting in December 1973 it was decided that this report should be issued. The pamphlet is therefore being sent to: local education authorities; colleges and departments of education; teachers' centres; directors of Council projects; and certain committees of the Council.

December 1973

Introduction

The Working Party on Dissemination was established by the Schools Council's Programme Committee in March 1972 with the following terms of reference:

> To consider the place of dissemination and in-service training in the work of the Council, with particular reference to curriculum projects financed and supported by the Council [and] to make proposals to Programme Committee.

The composition of the working party, which is set out in the Appendix, was widely representative of those concerned with curriculum development and its adoption. Because of its composition the working party has been able to proceed mainly by discussion of papers prepared by its members, though we were indebted to two non-members, Tony Becher of the Nuffield Foundation and Dr Marten Shipman, Evaluator of the Schools Council's Integrated Studies Project, for reading particularly stimulating papers to us on one occasion. We have also had access to the papers by Professor Eric Hoyle, David Bolam and Roger Watkins mentioned later in this report.

In addition, the working party invited all teachers' centre wardens to identify in writing weaknesses in current dissemination policy and discussed the sixty or so replies with a group of wardens, some of whom later attended the conference at which the recommendations were hammered out. The working party had a most useful discussion with representatives of the National Association of Inspectors of Schools and Educational Organizers, two of whose members became active participants at subsequent meetings of the working party and at the conference. The working party also had a valuable meeting with a group of educational publishers and with representatives of the BBC and the Independent Broadcasting Authority. An article - 'Dissemination: the task of the working party' - published in autumn 1972 in Dialogue, Schools Council Newsletter No.12, set out the working party's aims but unfortunately failed to stimulate the response from teachers in general which had been hoped for.

Our report is in two parts. In the first, we attempt to set down the general principles which, in our view, should inform the Council's policy on dissemination and this obliges us to stray somewhat beyond our terms of reference and to look at curriculum development in the round.

In the second part, we have listed a number of practical recommendations.

We hope we shall not be judged by the recommendations alone. They speak to an immediate situation and for that reason are important. But what we try to face up to first of all is the shift in concern about curriculum development, from the formulation of ideas and materials to their adoption in schools. There is inevitably a feeling - and some of our recommendations by themselves might lend it support - that failure to adopt new ideas is simply a failure of communication. This we consider to be only partly true and the misunderstanding which it occasions to be responsible for much of the distrust which curriculum innovators encounter.

In all our deliberations we have received much help and guidance from our Secretary, J.H. Thompson, who has been responsible for the drafting of this report and to whose organization and wise counsel we are greatly indebted.

Part I: PRINCIPLES OF DISSEMINATION POLICY

1. The Setting

The Schools Council has been in existence since 1964 and to date has funded or contributed to the funding of 160 curriculum or research projects at a total cost of £6 million. It would be quite false to suppose that dissemination (or diffusion, to use the older term) has only just become an issue.* All projects seek to proselytize and all proselytizers by the nature of their calling are dissatisfied with results. Projects have been developing ways of influencing people as long as they have been developing ideas and materials. A number of factors, however, have combined to make dissemination an issue of current importance.

In the first place, no funding agency gets into its stride for a number of years. Not only does the volume of work build up but thinking is concentrated at first on the problems of establishing and running projects. It is only when a project nears its end that anxiety about dissemination becomes acute. Very few projects ended before 1971. In 1972 and 1973 twenty-eight materials-producing projects are due to end and this excludes those culminating in reports alone, for which dissemination is an issue of a different kind.

Secondly, the Council has so far allowed the project director virtual autonomy in the running of the project within the limits of the proposal. Coupled with a considerable turnover in committee membership and Council staff, this has had the effect of making dissemination a free-enterprise activity, the nature of which is not generally well understood. With so many projects completing their work, one can assess the techniques of dissemination so far used and identify ways in which more systematic help might be given.

Thirdly, the Council hitherto has had little alternative to allowing projects an extension of life when dissemination activity has been insufficient. There is little doubt that in many cases

---

* A distinction is sometimes made in curriculum development writing between 'diffusion' and 'dissemination'. The former term is usually taken to indicate the spread of ideas in a relatively unstructured fashion. The latter implies a conscious strategy on the part of the project or a central agency to effect change (see, for example, E. Hoyle's 'Strategies of curriculum change', referred to below (p.21)). In this report we use 'dissemination' to include any activity which is designed to communicate a project's ideas to a wider audience, although, as will become evident, we accept the need to plan these activities as part of a project's work.

this help is too little and comes too late. A continuous drain on resources which is of uncertain value represents two reasons for seeking an effective alternative policy.

Fourthly, the concern of teachers' centre wardens at many aspects of project dissemination was communicated to the Council through its Field Officers' regional conferences in 1971 and 1972. Teachers' centres do not exist to promote Schools Council projects more than others, but their number is a crucial element in any dissemination strategy, especially when so many projects are ending together and the burden on those schools which wish to assimilate them is greater than ever before.

Lastly, at the time of the James Report, Teacher Education and Training, and the White Paper, Education: a Framework for Expansion (HMSO, 1972), there was a need to examine the Council's role in the training of teachers and to assess the contribution which the Council's projects might make to in-service training in the future.

2. Successful Dissemination

These then are the factors which made our examination of dissemination policy timely; and many of our recommendations are concerned with them. But we soon saw the short-sightedness of regarding dissemination as a set of techniques or devices and our task as being to advise how or when to apply them. The issue is much subtler than this, involving a view of the nature of curriculum development itself and incorporating different kinds of projects, the stages they have reached and the level of interest and involvement of their audiences. While it is impossible in a short statement to do justice to this degree of complexity we do attempt as a starting-point to summarize the principles which we think govern successful dissemination.

We believe that dissemination has been successful when teachers understand the project's ideas and materials sufficiently well to use them in school if they choose to do so. We are concerned with communicating understanding to the point at which informed choices can be made and sustained.

It follows that we are anxious to improve communications in order to ensure that the information given matches the requirements and increases the understanding of those receiving it. We are anxious too that the teachers' choice should not be circumscribed by lack of organizational support. Much of this report is an extension of these central concerns.

Some may find this initial statement over simple, because we have defined 'success' in a way that is incapable of measurement. But in curriculum development very little can be measured. Even hard facts like sales figures of project materials do not say how many are used, let alone used as the project intended. Nor do the figures reveal those influenced by the project's thinking but not using its materials. We consider the evaluation of dissemination later (pp.25-7). Here, perhaps it is enough to say that we are concerned with raising the standards of communication to a level at which it is reasonable to suppose that choice can be based on understanding.

3. Outline of Dissemination Strategy

We now try to put ourselves in the position of a project director and ask what broad criteria he should adopt in devising his dissemination strategy. He will have to make an early start. At the present time, but only since the Eastbourne Conference of Programme Committee in 1971, proposers of projects are expected to make some allowance for in-service training and after-care in their costings and therefore to give preliminary thought to these activities even before the project is launched. Half-way through a project's life, the director will be expected to make final decisions on after-care.*

These arrangements have been widely interpreted as extending to all forms of dissemination. They are sound in that they point to the need for dissemination activity from the earliest days but allow projects to determine what kind of activity is most appropriate to their work. They help to move directors away from the mistaken notion that dissemination is an identifiable stage in project development, occurring after the formulation and trial of materials and either before or at the same time as publication. We endorse these arrangements, though they leave directors a fairly wide discretion. How should they use it?

First of all, we believe that dissemination should be taken into account in the initial planning of a project and form part of the project's work from a very early stage. Moreover, we believe that projects should follow a policy of positive promotion of their ideas and materials. We recognize that some will see in this the incursion of the market-place into the classroom, but all we are saying is that it is wrong to expend public money on educational research considered by the appropriate Council committees to be desirable and then risk wasting it because teachers are unaware of the results. Positive promotion is not the hard sell. Those who decry it have a poorer view of teachers' ability to judge the results of curriculum development than the working party.

Positive promotion does raise a dilemma of a more serious kind. No one who engages in curriculum development can regard teaching as a static activity. Yet every project, when it has produced its 'package' of ideas and materials and sets about promoting them, looks as though it is claiming to have brought certainty to at least part of the curriculum. This dilemma arises, we think, from confusing the function of curriculum development with its product. It is only as projects announce their conclusions to date, and announce them positively, that teachers can be persuaded to take them into schools. But curriculum development is not frozen at this point. The process continues as teachers use, adapt and experiment with the new materials and methods. A project which is hesitant about making an impact on teachers simply misses its chance to contribute to the rising tide of curriculum change.

---

* The terms of the resolution adopted by the Programme Committee in October 1971 were:

> An element should be built in to the estimates for relevant projects at the Round II stage to develop in-service materials and continuing existence for a short while of skeleton project teams. The final decision on after-care and any additional grant to be provided should be decided by the Programme Committee about half-way through the life of the projects.

Secondly, a project aims to influence a wide range of people. Their perceptions of the project's aims are not only likely to be different from the project's own, but also from one another's.* Projects speak not so much to a widely drawn audience as to a number of different audiences: advisers, headteachers, class teachers, teachers' centre wardens, initial and in-service tutors in a variety of institutions. Projects need to know how each group responds to the development of the work and to establish and satisfy what each group requires in the way of information, involvement and materials. The composition of Project Consultative Committees, particular issues of newsletters, conferences, questionnaires - all the familiar methods of communicating and stimulating response - should be used with particular audiences in mind.

Thirdly, those whom the project hopes to influence come into contact with it at different stages in its development and their needs for dissemination material vary on this account. Three broad stages can be distinguished: general interest and awareness, trial and evaluation of materials and adoption (or rejection). The project's dissemination programme will be planned to match these stages but the stages will overlap.†

(a) General awareness and interest

Success at this stage would mean that all those to whom the project might be relevant and whose curricular choice it might extend would become aware of the following:

(i) the project's aims and philosophy;

(ii) its methods;

(iii) its context: where it fits in the curriculum, for which pupils it is intended;

(iv) its limitations;

(v) its proposed phasing;

(vi) where further information may be obtained;

(vii) where materials may be seen in use;

(viii) the implications of the project in terms of money, staff time, accommodation, etc.

At this stage communication would need to be relatively formal because of the size of the audience. There would be personal contact with potential adopters through meetings, conferences and teachers' study groups and impersonal contact through circular letters, articles in journals and newspapers and the preparation of audio-visual materials for use in teachers' centres, colleges of education and elsewhere. A well-placed and well-timed feature article in the press can do much to increase understanding of a project's aims, philosophy and scope.

---

* See, for example, M.D. Shipman's 'Contrasting views of a curriculum project', Journal of Curriculum Studies, vol.4 (November 1972), 145-53.

† These stages of project life are generalized and simplified. They show the impact of the project on its audience, rather than the stages by which materials are developed. The middle stage is not relevant for projects culminating in reports alone and will take a different form for those concerned less with pupils' materials than with in-service training.

If interest were not rewarded with some such contact with the project, this stage of dissemination could not be described as successfully accomplished. And if the supply of further and more detailed information to all (teachers and others) who show interest is accepted as essential the implications in terms of project staffing are obvious. It is at this stage that many projects begin to find their resources taxed beyond capacity.

(b) Trial and evaluation

Teachers engaged in the project's trials can expect to have had informal support from the project team; but teachers more loosely associated with these, or wishing in due course to involve themselves on their own initiative will require an equal degree of support, supplied, perhaps, by their local adviser, tutor from the local Area Training Organization or teachers' centre leader.

Dissemination, to be successful at this stage, should ensure that teachers are not only quite clear about the project's aims and general philosophy but, also, that the heads, advisers and others who are in a position to help the teacher are fully aware of what is happening.

Successful dissemination will normally be dependent upon the existence of a well-organized and consistently supported network of teachers' group leaders who will need to maintain effective channels of communication inward to the project and outward to the individual teachers in their region.

In the past it has been necessary to limit, severely, the numbers of schools participating in trials and as associates. If, as is frequently suggested, the success of a project's dissemination programme is in proportion to the number of teachers from trial and associate schools who have been involved, it may be that future projects will need to think in terms of accommodating a greater percentage of those schools which apply to participate. Should this happen, the task of organizing support for the teachers concerned would be formidable and expensive.

(c) Adoption (or rejection)

In the past the problems of dissemination have been most acute at the time when the project ends and immediately afterwards. In schools there are some teachers who have already used the materials, others who are familiar with the ideas involved, and yet others whose interest is still at the initial stage. Their respective requirements are quite different but could be met by a network of local support which can recognize and respond to the needs of each group. The project should have provided specific material to help organizers of such local support.

Direct responsibility for dissemination may well have passed from the project team by this time, since the majority of project materials will be adopted after the team has disbanded, most probably leaving behind them films, tape-slide programmes and other means of providing information about their thinking. Success at this stage will largely depend upon the extent to which the project has organized, or encouraged

the organization of a continuing training programme and local support systems which will outlive the project itself. The following will be needed:

(i) a continuing programme of in-service training;

(ii) initial training: the inclusion of the materials in the curricula of some colleges and departments of education;

(iii) opportunities for teachers to discuss and adapt materials for local use.

4. Dissemination as Information

From now on we shall be looking at the project from the outside and considering ways in which the Council and other bodies might help the project director realize the dissemination strategy just outlined. We first retrace our steps to the stage we have called general awareness and interest and consider dissemination in the sense in which it is most commonly used, the passing of information to teachers and others about the work of a project.

Although most projects would claim to disseminate in this sense we were impressed by evidence that it was often a haphazard and fitful activity, rarely started in a substantial way early in the project's life. We heard from teachers' centre wardens that early contacts with projects were often not maintained and that there was little ongoing information about project development. We realize that in the beginning projects are busy appointing staff, planning their work and canvassing support from local authorities. Apart from a natural preoccupation with their own organization at this stage, it might reasonably be said that projects have nothing yet to disseminate. But there is one activity which cannot begin too soon and that is for the Council and the project together to build up systematically a list of critical or interested friends all over the country in schools, teachers' centres, colleges,* institutes and local education authorities, and to take steps to maintain regular contact with them.

If this seems elementary and therefore critical of projects to say that some do not do it, we must also say that we were impressed by the real, if unintentional, communications barrier which faces projects when dealing with colleges and local authorities. We felt very strongly that it was the Council's business to try to improve matters on a national scale and we make this our first recommendation. The aim is to create a network of communications by means of liaison officers who will act as points of contact for projects in the institutions in which they serve. Equally important they will be a means of contact with projects for those within the institutions who wish to offer guidance and practical assistance to projects. It is important to stress that the flow of information between projects, the Council, local authorities, colleges, institutes and ATOs will be in any direction desired. Liaison officers will require a certain amount of induction and this should be provided by the Council.

Appointments in colleges, institutes and Area Training Organizations are already being made. We leave it to the Council to judge when the time is ripe to approach local education authorities. Our own feeling

---

* Throughout this report references to colleges or colleges of education should be taken as applying equally to departments of education in universities and polytechnics.

is that, because of local government reorganization, it ought not to be before autumn 1973. Moreover, since the role of liaison officers in local education authorities would be so closely bound up with local support for innovation, we think both issues should be dealt with at the same time, and this would require preparation. We discuss the matter further in section 9 (pp.21-2).

We have reviewed the Council's existing contributions to the network of information about projects and were encouraged to learn from the teachers' centre wardens of the value of the Schools Council Project Profiles and Index. We know from what they said that the new bulletin, Project News, will have met a need. The report on the distribution of Dialogue unfortunately came too late in our deliberations for us to make a sustained comment, but we have recorded some minor suggestions which we hope the Editorial Board of the newsletter will find useful (Recommendation 4).

The recommendations on the size of the Field Officer team and on area information centres (Recommendations 2 and 3) are also designed to strengthen communications. The case for the former arises from general satisfaction with the work now being undertaken and a desire to see it extended. On information centres, we suggest a cautious approach through the establishment of an experimental centre - this has already been agreed and will be situated in Newcastle-upon-Tyne - and the issue of a discussion paper to gain the reactions of local authorities and others. In the following section we set out the working party's view of centres.

5. Area Information Centres

The purpose of the centres would be to provide comprehensive and detailed information about curriculum development within reasonable access of teachers and in a setting associated with training and professional growth. The range of material provided would be at least as broad as that now on display at the Council's Project Information Centre and would include local curriculum materials. Teachers would be able to handle and study in depth all available examples of curriculum material and, because of the setting, the work of the projects would become a living part of in-service training and the other professional activities of the centre.

The effectiveness of the centres would depend on their accessibility to teachers and the range of resources provided. Obviously some balance would have to be struck between convenience and service and it is for economic reasons as well as professional that we see centres as located in host institutions such as colleges and departments of education, or the larger teachers' centres.

It is important to emphasize that nothing we have said about area centres should be construed as lessening the ties between the Council and teachers' centres. They will continue to house a considerable range of curriculum material and provide an outlet for information about Council projects. The case for area centres rests on establishing a local need for a service which may not at present be provided by teachers' centres or elsewhere.

As with the establishment of teachers' centres, the Council may be the prime mover, but it is for local education authorities to decide and act. We think the ideas set out above are worth discussion with local

authorities in the light of the Newcastle experiment and in the context of the White Paper, Education: a Framework for Expansion.

6. Dissemination through Involvement

So far we have been considering ways of improving the supply of information about projects through better communications and the provision of information centres within the reach of teachers. The second stage of a project's life - trials and evaluation - is a reminder that understanding of curriculum development also comes through involvement or association with projects.

Involvement can be in many forms and we first consider one which we feel the Council may too easily be taking for granted. This is the effective association of teachers serving in schools and colleges with the choice of curriculum development projects to be undertaken. This association should be as direct as possible so that the relevance of projects to classroom needs may be increased and the problems of dissemination diminished.

It is tempting to dismiss this suggestion on the grounds that it is impracticable. Yet we have to record our impression that many teachers, for whose benefit the Council exists, regard it as remote and its projects as irrelevant to their work. We think that serious consideration must be given to ways of improving the Council's image, which in the present context means ensuring that projects meet teachers' needs. For a start, we suggest that the Council should from time to time determine areas in which curriculum development is, in its judgement, needed, and arrange to publicize these decisions in the appropriate journals of teachers' and subject associations. Teachers' reactions would be specifically sought and be taken into account when Round I and Round II proposals - the two stages in the Council's consideration of all proposals - were considered. Opportunities for teachers to submit their own Round I proposals should also be made more widely known (Recommendations 34 and 35).

We now turn to more conventional forms of involvement. Teachers may be seconded to work as members of the central project team, or they may join discussion or working groups which actually prepare pupils' or teachers' materials. Teachers trying out materials and helping to evaluate them are also closely associated in the creative work of the project. There are several reasons for welcoming these kinds of involvement: it is a valuable method of in-service education; it helps to keep the project's thinking and materials orientated towards school needs; and it provides projects with a rudimentary network for dissemination. But in the present context the value of teachers' involvement is that it enables a few teachers in a few areas to gain a deep understanding of the project's aims and methods.

Why do we place the emphasis here? For projects concerned with curriculum innovation, adoption rests on changing teachers' attitudes, or the school curriculum, in fundamental ways. As we see it, involvement in the project is a most effective way of influencing teachers' attitudes to their own professionalism and to the curriculum. Having said this, we fully recognize that adoption rests not only on winning a teacher's support for a project's ideas but on the extent to which the school's

organization and the teacher's colleagues enable these changes to take place. It is too easy for those outside schools to underestimate pressures of this kind.

The fact must be faced, however, that involvement at this level can only be for the few. This will be so, even if, as noted above (p.13), there is a case for facing up to the financial consequences of extending the number of teachers engaged in project work and some hope that the project involvement will be a recognized form of in-service training (see p.23). We come then to the question of what kind of training is capable of simulating the experiences of those fortunate enough to have been involved.

Two methods occur to us. One, used by the Humanities Curriculum Project, is the 'training the trainers' programme, which is in essence a series of in-service training courses for teachers, who will then help others in their own locality. The other method would be to prepare during the life of a project a set of training materials which would enable adopting teachers to trace all the stages of a project's development and undergo at one remove the modification of insights experienced by those actually involved. (1)* Neither method - and we do not see them as alternatives - could be tackled by a project without special funding.

We have been writing as though all projects are concerned with fundamental ideas of curriculum innovation. This we do not believe. But even when projects appear simply to be introducing new materials for pupils there can be problems over new ways of working and new teaching strategies involving quite important changes in teachers' behaviour. While we would not expect either of the two methods just described to be essential other than for a minority of projects, we do believe that training materials for teachers is an issue of central importance which for the most part has been neglected by projects. We have devoted a section of the recommendations to this subject (pp.34-5) and now consider the background.

7. Training Materials

The aim of dissemination policy, as the working party sees it, is to increase teachers' effective choice of curricular methods and materials by ensuring an adequate understanding of what is offered by curriculum projects. Training materials are an essential means of giving and increasing understanding. The issue only becomes complicated when one tries to match the training needs of quite distinct groups, such as colleges of education, in-service training agencies and serving teachers, with a multiplicity of projects demanding different levels of understanding and study. While this means that it is almost certainly impossible to fashion one standard policy for training materials, some rationalization is desirable. (2)

The way we have approached the problem is to agree on what we mean by training materials, without claiming that every project needs to provide every item in the list, or that every user requires the same selection of items. The full list is set out in Note (3).

---

* Numbers in brackets refer to the Notes at the end of Part I (pp.30-2).

There are, in addition, a number of general points related to the problems of innovation that are not exclusive to one particular project. Examples taken from a number of projects to highlight general issues related to innovation - such as organizational implications, attitudes and relationships, assessment, training and support requirements - may be as essential as specific training materials for particular projects.

Working against a list of this kind, project directors would be expected to determine what sort of materials to produce (given the funding of the project and the degree of training or re-training implicit in the project's aims and objectives) after consultation with representatives of such groups as students, classroom teachers, heads of department, headteachers, advisers, teachers' centre wardens and lecturers.

This raises three questions:

(i) How do the teams obtain professional advice on:

  (a) the preparation and design of audio-visual materials; and
  (b) their appropriateness for initial and in-service training?

(ii) How are the production and distribution of training materials to be co-ordinated?

(iii) What machinery is required for testing the effectiveness of different kinds of training materials?

The point behind these questions is that the preparation of really professional training materials requires skills which only very large project teams are likely to be able to provide for themselves. There seems to be a case therefore for centralizing some of the work. There might, for example, be professional Council staff skilled in the preparation of training materials, with a research and development function. They would work closely with individual projects and their publishers, advising on the materials to be prepared and on the technical questions concerned with their preparation. They would also be responsible for gathering and seeking advice from initial and in-service training agencies, in general terms and in relation to individual projects. Indeed there might additionally be a steering group representing such interests, to include teachers' centre wardens and Field Officers.

This kind of arrangement would greatly improve the after-care help which the Council can now offer in that there would be machinery for distributing and reviewing training materials and in some cases for overseeing their production or completion when the project team has dispersed. The Council's contribution to sustaining innovation would in this way become significant.

There is the additional argument that to focus attention on training within the structure of the Council would be a timely and apt response to developments outside.

We are not, however, totally convinced that a central training unit would be viable. It is not simply a question of estimating the demand for its services, but of being sure that the professional requirements in terms of personnel could be economically met. Moreover we would not wish to preclude a project team from seeking advice on their own initiative from those experienced in in-service training. We remain

convinced of the importance of training materials and of the duty of the Council to help projects attain a high professional standard in producing them. But we feel that discussions with, say, the Council for Educational Technology in the United Kingdom and the Open University Design Unit would help determine the best way of achieving these ends. In the meantime we feel that the establishment of a fund to help projects about to end to produce audio-visual dissemination material has already justified itself and we recommend an extension (Recommendations 8 and 13).

8. Dissemination through after-care

We come now to the last stage in a project's life, the time when its materials and ideas are taken into schools, or are rejected. It is a familiar paradox that at this very moment the project team disperses. Teachers face the stress of implementation on their own and in particular without the help of those who understand the new ideas best.

In our view the dispersal of the team at about this time is inevitable. The regular funding of extensions for a year or two following the publication of materials would seriously curtail new curriculum development work; and after three or four years team members need to resume their own professional careers. In considering the sources of support for after-care we have thought it only realistic to assume that the team as such is no longer in being.

We have done so without any sense of dismay. In the first place, if a project team has pursued the kind of dissemination policy which we are advocating there will be a substantial body of teachers and trainers versed in its thinking and there will be ample training material suited to the varied needs of potential users. The project will have deliberately created the means of supporting its adoption. We only think now in terms of keeping the project alive somehow because as a rule this degree of support does not exist.

In the second place, although projects may stimulate curriculum innovation, it actually occurs in schools and on local initiative. A central project team, so well suited to the developmental stage, could not offer to respond to widespread requests for supporting initiatives of this kind and would have to rely, for the most part, on trained teachers in the field.

This legacy of support in the form of teachers and training materials is the single most important element in the help which can be offered to schools deciding to take up projects. Its creation is therefore the main strand in a project's dissemination strategy. From what has been said to us, however, it is apparent that teachers look also to the publishers and to the Council for after-care support and we have therefore re-examined their roles in this connection.

It is quite unfair in our view to expect publishers to carry the main burden of after-care support. They are responsible people and rightly want their representatives to be familiar with the project before the project team disperses, but the best representative could not offer to provide the sort of guidance which teachers are looking for. The publishers' representative must know the project's ideas, methods and materials well enough to discuss their significance with teachers, but he must also be armed with information about teachers and schools

experienced in the project who can take the discussion further (Recommendation 29).

Similarly, the publishers will, we hope, have been involved in the preparation of training materials, but it will be for others to organize their use. Publishers will arrange meetings and conferences to publicize the project, but former team members and trial school teachers will be the speakers (and we have suggested offering financial help in Recommendation 28).

We say this not to diminish the role of the publishers in dissemination but to clarify it. For many people the project only becomes real when its materials are published; and, because the team has dispersed, it is too easy to assume that the publishers have taken over the team's role and commitment. Adoption rests on understanding. Publishers help to impart understanding by their skill in presenting the project's ideas and materials; and - never to be underestimated - by the arrangements they make to let teachers handle the published materials and experiment with them before sale. But to the extent that projects cannot speak for themselves through their published materials it is wrong to try to shuffle off the main responsibility for after-care on to the publishers.

As we have said, some teachers look to the Council to assume responsibility for after-care. This is understandable. The Council has funded the project, its professional services have been made available to the team, its imprint is on the published material. Moreover, the close identification of a project team with its area of curriculum development makes it entirely natural to look for another centralized body, also associated with the work, to replace the team when it disperses. We certainly accept that the Council has a role in after-care, but it is important to stress that it too is supportive and not directive.

The Council's role in after-care is fourfold. It will be a source of information about the project and in particular will know the strength and identity of the project's support structure so that potential adopters can make contact with those able to help. It will be the means through which training material needed by adopters can be obtained. It will be the normal repository of information about the experiences of teachers as they adopt and adapt the project's materials. It will continue to have the responsibility of discussing with the publishers the need to revise published materials from time to time. But any idea that the Council can assume the mantle of the project team and somehow watch over and foster the adoption of its ideas and methods is illusory. This is not the function of the Council and its staff cannot know enough about individual projects to perform it.

One other source of support might be a college of education or some other institution of higher education which, because of earlier close association with a project, would be willing and able to offer help to schools adopting the project's materials and methods. We recognize the danger of appearing to institutionalize projects: curriculum development is not concerned to create orthodoxies. But equally there is a place in curriculum development, at present unfilled, for centres which could both moderate and monitor the experiences of

teachers after adoption. Colleges may not be the only means of providing this service but they would be very well qualified. We see this development as one of the possible consequences of the closer involvement of colleges with projects and hope that the new liaison committee formed by the Council, the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education (ATCDE) and the University Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET) will give it careful examination. We have endorsed the principle in Recommendation 25, although we recognize that not many arrangements of this kind will be possible.

We have made one particular proposal to assist adoption - Recommendation 27. It is for the appointment, at first on an experimental basis, of project teacher consultants. As teachers versed in the project they would be well qualified to help other teachers overcome the difficulties of introducing the project, and, being on secondment from their own schools, could cover much more ground than other teachers experienced in the project. A weakness of the proposal might be thought to be the financial limitation to making this kind of arrangement for every project in every part of the country. The difficulties of implementation in schools will not, however, require all projects to have teacher consultants and we should expect the Council to be highly selective as between projects.

We have one other more tentative suggestion for helping to support schools which are adopting projects. As a working party we have perhaps suffered from meeting for the most part between the publication of the James Report, Teacher Education and Training, and the White Paper, Education: a Framework for Expansion, but this has not prevented us from observing the place that professional centres might have in the support structure for innovation. Their local setting and their concern with in-service training would make them in two respects ideal focal points for project influence. Professor Eric Hoyle, of Bristol University School of Education, developed this idea in 'Strategies of curriculum change', an address which he gave at the conference on 'In-service Education for Teachers: the Next Five Years', held at Leeds University in July 1972. Apart from in-service training, he sees the professional centre as having possibly three other functions vis-a-vis innovation: that of providing a link between a national agency of curriculum development and innovating schools; of providing support for particular schools after the withdrawal of the project team; and of acting as a basis for a consultancy service. Our own thinking has been led in the same direction and, without the concept of professional centres, we would probably have moved towards the establishment of 'dissemination centres' with the sort of functions described by Professor Hoyle. We would like to see these ideas pursued in the discussion of area information centres, as the relationship between information, resources and in-service training is so very close (see pp.15-16 and 23).

9. Local Support for Innovation

As we have already noted, the role of the project changes when its task of development is completed. It ceases to be directive and becomes supportive, reflecting the fact that initiative has passed from the centre to the local school, and decision-taking is now about adoption not development.

The key to successful adoption is therefore a local one and whatever support is offered by the project, the Council and the publishers, the extent to which the local education authority is prepared to foster the development is likely to be crucial. Part of a project's normal dissemination activity will be designed to encourage support from local authorities. Among the other critical friends (see page 14) who are to be convinced and consulted throughout the development period and whose long-term needs are to be studied (when, for example, trial schools are chosen or training courses or conferences planned) are head-teachers - who increasingly in consultation with their staff determine their schools' curricula; advisers - who influence the allocation of resources; teachers' centre wardens - who stimulate interest in curriculum development; and wardens, advisers and Area Training Organization tutors - whose in-service training courses will sustain innovation.

In this section, however, we are primarily concerned with the local education authority's more general support for curriculum development through the allocation of adequate financial resources and the organization of advisory services. Many authorities have well-advanced arrangements for providing support for in-service training and curriculum development in which advisers, teachers' centres and colleges of education have well-defined roles. There is already a wide variety of successful practice but, so far as we have been able to discover, no published document recording it.

We have therefore taken steps to draw up such a statement ourselves covering a sample of representative authorities which might be used as part of the Council's approach to local education authorities (see also Recommendation 26 and pages 14-15). In this way we would hope to influence the arrangements made by both new and unchanged authorities to the ultimate benefit of the Council's projects.

At the same time, we have given some thought to the function of the local education authorities' liaison officers (see pages 14-15) and set them out below:

(i) general correspondence from the Council;

(ii) collection and distribution of more particular correspondence from the Council;

(iii) the collection and maintenance of appropriate stock of Council information and materials;

(iv) liaison with the work being done in schools on Council projects;

(v) maintenance of links with Field Officers.

It may be that some authorities would prefer these functions to be dispersed among a number of people: (iii) for example might be performed by a teachers' centre warden and (iv) by one adviser - or a number of advisers. The advantage of a single appointment is, however, obvious from the Council's point of view and we know of a large authority where in fact all these functions are performed by one Staff Inspector who is also responsible for in-service training. This particular combination is highly advantageous in our view.

10. Future Developments in Initial and In-Service Training

The White Paper, Education: a Framework for Expansion, indicates in broad terms the future development of the initial and in-service training of teachers. The Council's present and future role in this field was referred to by the Secretary of State in her address to the Governing Council in March 1973:

> Your terms of reference, as set out in the Constitution, direct your attention to curricula and teaching methods in schools. Since these are largely the result of the training teachers receive, before and during service, it is vital that those who train them should be familiar with the work of the Schools Council.

As we have already tried to make plain, we see curriculum development as requiring rather more than the adoption of new materials or changes of technique on the part of the teacher. The achievement of curriculum change also depends upon the deepening of the teacher's understanding and critical judgement of a project's ideas and materials. Meeting these requirements implies training and re-training in the ideas and methods of curriculum development, particularly through involvement in the process itself. We therefore look for curriculum development to form a significant element in the expanding programme of initial and in-service training and feel that there is a strong case for regarding some kinds of project involvement as falling within the arrangements outlined in the White Paper for releasing teachers for in-service training.

If the Council's role is to influence those responsible for this programme, then it must be near enough to the training agencies to know what assistance they require and to be able to respond to their demands. We have, therefore, proposed (Recommendation 14) that the Council should seek links with the Regional Committees which it is proposed will be responsible for 'promoting and overseeing the training arrangements including induction and in-service training, and the professional centres relating to both of these'.

The existing and developing links with the colleges and departments of education show much promise for future growth and should lead to a closer association with the curriculum development work of the Council. Projects will need to bear in mind that both students and teachers require distinctive training experiences calling for a variety of approach and method. The Schools Council/ATCDE/UCET Liaison Committee should provide a means of exchanging advice on these matters. Equally important will be the support of the training agencies in the development of professional centres, which could provide foci for local and national curriculum development. (See also pages 15-16 and 21.)

The White Paper notes that 'effective coordination needs the close co-operation of the LEAs, the training institutions and their staff and the teaching profession'. We have already emphasized the importance of strengthening the Council's partnership with the local education authorities, particularly with their advisory teams in support of curriculum development in schools. We would see this partnership as a basis for contributing to the growth of training linked to the curricular needs of schools.

Systematic and formal links with local advisers through Council members, Field Officers and project teams should be developed as a means

whereby the Council can exercise its good offices in facilitating closer co-operation at local level. This development is particularly important within the context of the reorganization of local government. The Council should therefore continue its discussions at local and national level with chief education officers and their advisory teams and should look for ways of closer involvement at all stages of project development and dissemination.

The degree to which projects and the Council are able to respond adequately in this field will depend on effective means of conveying teachers' needs to the project teams and of providing substantial advice with regard to training and liaison activities.

11. Press, Radio, Television and the Open University

We now look briefly at a medium which seems, at first sight, to offer considerable possibilities for assisting and widening the dissemination process. Some educational journalists have consistently shown that they are interested in curriculum reform and Council projects receive on the whole adequate coverage and a very fair press. Several journalists have made it clear that they are particularly interested in learning how the work of the projects can be carried on in schools after the project teams have been dispersed. Both the BBC and the Independent Broadcasting Authority (through the ITV Companies) have shown interest in the work of the Council and incorporated the ideas of several projects in their programme output. The BBC has also made extensive reference to projects in their teacher-directed series.

The Open University has used project personnel in its Educational Studies units and has included film and discussion of a variety of projects, both as subject content and to illustrate the process of innovation.

The Council is discussing with the Open University ways in which their highly advanced facilities for communications and data analysis might be used to improve the organization of curriculum development projects. A number of models have been developed for joint study. Their relevance to dissemination is the possibility of being able to involve more teachers in project work by increasing the number of local development groups or trial schools which a central project team could manage.

So far as we are aware there is only one Open University course which is directly based on a Council project and two series of television programmes designed to illustrate and discuss a specific project.* This is the kind of relationship which many project directors desire but we have concluded that it is likely to remain exceptional. The time schedules of course preparation and programme

---

* The Open University course is based on Project Technology. ATV are hoping to develop three programmes on the Integrated Studies Project in association with the project and the publishers, Oxford University Press, and Thames TV are presenting a series Starting Out which is being made in close association with the Council's Moral Education projects.

planning are totally different from those of projects. The cost of mounting new Open University courses is high, there are many competing claims and we presume that the Council is unlikely to wish to divert its own funds for this purpose. The broadcasting authorities have an overriding commitment to their own audiences and are under no obligation or constraint to use material that they have not originated themselves.

Nevertheless, it is important that the Council should continue its close informal contact with the BBC and IBA in order to influence both programme planning and the content of teacher-directed programmes where the achievements to date are substantial. The broadcasting authorities will also be interested in our projects when the producer is convinced of an audience (as with the RoSLA programmes) and when their message is topical. It is really a question of recognizing the limitations of the market open to Council projects and of making the most of it. For example, it is little use making first contact with the producer when a project's publication date is finally settled, if by then the programme production schedules have been finalized. We shall include information about the timing of production schedules, together with useful addresses, in the supplement to the Council's Handbook for Project Directors and Grant-holders (see also Recommendation 16 (ii)).

The opportunities in local radio are also substantial and the Council is already in fairly close touch with the educational producers in the twenty stations. On the Press side, the Council is keen to develop its contacts with local journalists and to discuss with project directors how to do this.

The Council is represented on the Advisory Committee of the Open University's Faculty of Educational Studies and on its sub-committees. There is also a good deal of contact at staff level. Arising from these contacts, the Council has recently been invited to help plan some proposed new Open University courses in areas where projects are also working. We hope that similar opportunities will arise to increase co-operation between the Council and the Open University.

12. Evaluation of Dissemination

In this section we set out the background to Recommendations 30 to 33. The first problem is to identify the criteria of successful dissemination. The following was our own starting-point:

> ... dissemination has been successful when teachers understand the project's ideas and materials sufficiently well to use them in school if they choose to do so. (p.10)

As we went on to say, the criteria of success proposed in this statement are largely intangible and thus immeasurable. It is not easy to judge whether teachers 'understand' material or whether an idea has been adopted. The criteria are also general.

With particular strategies of dissemination the prospects are more hopeful. The aims and expected outcome of, say, issuing a newsletter to mathematics teachers should be amenable to a more precise definition.

Furthermore, it should be possible to specify closely the intended recipients, the geographical area to be covered, the time period of interest and other boundary conditions. This would make an evaluator's task much more practicable, though it would still be difficult to judge the newsletter's success in conveying the project's philosophy.

This leads on to the second major problem which arises from the difficulty of tracing the acceptance of the concepts, ideas and philosophies which curriculum innovators try to disseminate. Even if an evaluator confines his interest in dissemination to hard facts, such as the sales figures of materials published, there will still be imponderables, as we noted earlier (p. 10). In such a situation, when a single measurement or a criterion is suspect, it is sound practice to aggregate information from a number of different measurements. This technique, we feel, is bound to be a feature of the evaluation of dissemination.

The findings of this kind of evaluation would be used to determine future policy and to improve the effectiveness of dissemination strategies. It might take one or more of the following forms:

(i) Concurrent evaluation

The project's dissemination strategies would be evaluated as they occurred, and altered in the light of information gained on their effectiveness. It will be seen that concurrent evaluation of a project's dissemination strategies is closely related to established ideas of formative evaluation.

(ii) Evaluation 'across' projects

Individual projects differ in the range of dissemination strategies they employ but it is possible to identify groups of projects which have common elements. These common elements could be evaluated in one activity if evaluators were appointed to work simultaneously with more than one project. There would be two main advantages: attention could be focused on problems of general concern, and projects would benefit immediately from the experience of others.

(iii) Studies of specific dissemination techniques

The aim would be to arrive at an understanding of the technique chosen for the benefit of future projects. Examples of subjects which might be studied are the use of project conferences, the movement of teachers from trial schools, the use of the mass media and dissemination through teachers' centres.

(iv) Analytical studies and case histories

These studies of past experience are based on the established idea of summative (or posthumous) evaluation, whose relationship to dissemination was noted in a recent Council committee paper.* Periodical assessments of the 'take-up' of projects would come under this heading.

---

* 'Policy on evaluation', paper presented to meeting of Programme Committee of the Schools Council, 27 February 1973 (unpublished).

(v) Beyond evaluation

Increasing the effectiveness of dissemination rests on answering a number of questions which would at best be only partially covered by the work already suggested. For example, how are decisions to adopt new ideas or materials actually taken? What are the constraints on exercising 'informed choice' in practice? What are the barriers to implementation in schools? Providing the answers to such questions will involve more than narrowly evaluative approaches. Surveys and research work will be required.

Some work in these five areas is already being done. The History, Geography and Social Science 8–13 Project is planning to undertake concurrent evaluation and is the first Council project to be funded for this purpose. The Social Science Research Council has funded the Chelsea Diffusion Research Project which is working mainly in the areas described in (iv) and (v) above. Its report, which is expected towards the end of 1974, will throw a good deal of light on some of the practical difficulties which evaluators face in this field. We have had the advantage of advice from the project director, Dr P. Kelly, on more than one occasion. A new project working within the areas covered by (iv) and (v) is an evaluative study of a number of Schools Council projects entitled 'Success and Failure and Recent Innovations'; the project is being undertaken at the University of East Anglia and is being funded by the Ford Foundation (4). Incidentally, we should also perhaps record that we have made a modest foray into the area covered by (iii) above for the purposes of this report.

In our view, there is a call to do much more. The studies described in (i) and (ii) would involve evaluators working within projects in a way which has become familiar. Where the work proposed is not directly linked to projects – (iii), (iv) and (v) above – others must be called upon. The Schools Council Research Team, or outside agencies such as the National Foundation for Educational Research, come immediately to mind but we feel that departments and colleges of education might also be interested on the basis of conventionally funded work, through the institution of Schools Council Research Fellowships for suitably qualified teachers.

13. General Considerations for the Council

Our discussions have also led us to suggest a number of areas of general policy which the Council might consider:

(i) We feel that the senior Council committees should receive regular reports on the operation of projects and discuss them as informally as possible with the director and the evaluator.

This is also important when the project has finished its work. We ourselves have learnt much from a report written by David Bolam on his Integrated Studies Project.* In this way the Council committees would learn at first hand of the problems of project operation and be able to consider whether, by some general policy change, they could be overcome in future.

---

* Unpublished, but see David Bolam's interesting account of the project, 'Teamwork to launch teamwork', which appeared in Ideas, No. 24 (January 1973), a curriculum magazine published by Goldsmiths' College, University of London.

(ii) We think that the Council should consider ways of monitoring the take-up of selected projects over a number of years. The Council seems to us to be exposing itself quite unnecessarily to criticism that the effect of curriculum development work is not measured. Although it is a separate point, we think that some research into school-based problems of adoption might well be undertaken. (Both points have been mentioned in the previous section as illustrations of evaluation work but we draw attention to them again.)

(iii) We think there is a case for a study of the relevance and distinctive characteristics of different styles of curriculum development and in particular the relationship of local curriculum development work to national. We attempted something of the sort ourselves but had neither the resources nor the time to complete it.

14. Conclusions

As this report indicates, we have confined ourselves very largely to the present situation of the Council as a central agency funding national projects and to the problems of dissemination which result. This seemed to be required by our terms of reference and the discussion of Programme Committee which gave rise to the establishment of the working party. We did not feel that any of the problems of dissemination which we have examined were so intractable that, in themselves, they challenged the idea of national curriculum development projects. Nor was it apparent to us that any more localized form of curriculum development would avoid these problems, except that by being content to influence the local situation alone one could ignore dissemination completely. While we have felt it proper in the previous paragraph to encourage the Council to study alternative ways of undertaking curriculum development, we consider that this report must speak to a situation which exists and which is likely to continue both in its own right and as a stimulus to other forms of activity.

We have not recommended any change in the Council's policy that projects are responsible for planning their own dissemination strategies and for meeting the cost from their own funds, but we do see the Council playing a stronger supportive role. This will be evident from what we have said, for example, about a network of communications, central support for the preparation of training materials, the financing of project teacher consultants and Council initiative over area information centres and local structures for sustaining innovation.

A firmer relationship between the Council and its projects is also implicit in our suggestion that projects should plan dissemination to certain defined ends and in our recognition that the Council would have to will the means.

This insistence on planning and promotion will not be welcomed by some. We do not claim that all projects' work is equally good. We do say that many more teachers should be given a fair opportunity to judge a project and choose for themselves whether or not to adopt it. This must mean an end to the chance encounters of the past. But it also implies that dissemination material is designed not just to publicize but to convey understanding. For this reason we have suggested increasing

the involvement of teachers in the creative side of project work, the preparation of professionally produced training material suited to a variety of needs and the building up of a body of teachers able to interpret the project in a school setting.

The days when one could assume that most curriculum development ideas would find a ready welcome from teachers and that schools would be only too anxious to adapt their curricula to accommodate new approaches are long since past. The reality is that changes in the curriculum require not only willingness on the part of teachers to change their ideas but also the capacity to implement these changes. The true targets of curriculum innovators are the teacher's knowledge, skill and understanding. This is why, although a communications system is needed, dissemination is more than a system. And it is also why a system, however flawless, will fail to guarantee the adoption of a project.

The successful implementation of new ideas depends also upon the extent to which the local authority's advisory and administrative arrangements, as well as those of the school, positively encourage and foster curriculum development. However willing teachers may be to implement new ideas their capacity to do so may be negated by financial and organizational pressures both inside and outside the school. We are not arguing here for the uncritical acceptance of all projects' work. What we are saying is that innovation rests on the co-operation of the teacher and the interested adviser who are both convinced of the rightness of a project's ideas for the particular school, underpinned by a general framework of training and financial support.

If we were to try to say in a sentence what our aim has been it would be to close the gap between those engaged in project work and those in school who have the opportunity to profit by it. This gap is not just geographical, though better communications are needed. There is a gap in understanding which is much harder to bridge. We see it like this: the justification of curriculum development is to raise standards in school and to enable teachers to make the most effective advance in the interests of their children; if the Council is serious about widening teachers' choice in the curriculum we have to help teachers deepen their critical judgement about what is on offer; and if the ideas of a project are not in the end understood, whether or not the materials are applied, the project, quite bluntly, will have failed.

Notes

(1) The working party took this idea from a paper submitted by Roger Watkins of Leeds University Institute of Education. It impressed the working party a great deal and we modelled Recommendation 9 (see p.34) on it. As an illustration of this idea, Mr Watkins suggested that a curriculum development team might present its conclusions to teachers in the form of a series of instructional tape-slide units, as follows:

Unit 1 might be concerned with the team's review of the present situation and include examples of syllabuses, tape-recorded interviews with teachers, slides of related work.

Unit 2 might be concerned with objectives in this area of the curriculum and include taped interviews with subject specialists, discussion about the usefulness of objectives and an exercise on the selection of objectives.

Unit 3 might be concerned with the evolution of materials, tracing their development from the earliest drafts.

Unit 4 might demonstrate strategies for the use of materials and include tape-slide sequences of work in trial schools.

Unit 5 might be concerned with the implications of the project for inter-staff relationships, timetabling, finance and resources. The emphasis might be on the provision of case studies.

Unit 6 might be largely an in-tray exercise based on incidents collected during project trials confronting the would-be adopters with a series of reactions including, for example, hostility from colleagues and/or parents and lack of co-operation from ancillary staff.

The cost of these units would be comparatively high and they would be used only once by a school. He therefore suggested that they might be borrowed from the Schools Council or from a teachers' centre when a school was considering the adoption of a curriculum innovation. The cost of investing in these units would contrast very favourably with the cost of sending teachers on diffusion courses.

(2) We have not concerned ourselves with the standardization of training materials because of the CET Working Party on Standards and Specifications for Educational and Training Equipment. This working party was set up in the autumn of 1971 to represent users' views and is broadly representative of all sectors of education and training and acts both as a forum for discussion of needs and requirements and as a channel of communication through which recommendations can flow to and from users. The working party is represented on a British Standards Institution Sub-committee which is considering the educational and training applications of recording equipment and systems. The working party aims to produce a series of user's specifications (USPECs) which will be the basis for discussions with manufacturers and purchasing authorities.

USPECs have already been produced on overhead projectors and synchronized-visual systems, and are planned on film cassette systems, cassette audio-tape recorders, blackboard substitutes, filmstrip/slide projectors for individual and small group use, projection screens, plugs and connectors, micro projectors, epidiascopes, marker pens for overhead projectors, transparencies, storage containers, VHF receiving equipment and microforms.

(3) The full list of training materials would comprise:

(a) General information about the project, its history, aims, objectives, philosophy and teaching strategy.

(b) Detailed examination and understanding

(i) Published material. Wherever possible publishers of large expensive kits should be asked also to produce and make available sample kits.

(ii) A good introductory handbook.

(iii) Tape-recorded interview with project director.

(iv) Tape-recorded discussion with trial school teachers.

(v) Film, videotape or tape-slide sequence showing the materials in use in the classroom, and including a discussion with the pupils.

(vi) Simulation exercises or problem-solving activities to involve the group in the project's methods and approach.

(c) Implications of adoption

(i) Organizing the project within the school.

(ii) The relation of the project to other subjects within the curriculum.

(iii) Timetabling.

(iv) Staffing: the number of staff and the particular skills required.

(v) Class size.

(vi) The cost of adopting materials and possible additional expenditure.

(vii) The suitability of projects to all levels of ability.

(viii) Internal assessment and external examinations.

(d) Modifying insights

The series of units, outlined in Note (1) above, intended to take teachers through the stages of development of the project team's thinking.

(e) Further information

(i) Details of members of the project team, trial school teachers, and area representatives who can still be called upon to help.

(ii) Details of an 'after-care centre' if there is one, and/or formalized groups of teachers concerned with the project's ideas.

(iii) Evaluation reports outlining how teachers already involved in the project are reacting to it.

(iv) A discussion of the relationship between this and other relevant curriculum projects.

(4) This project is being directed by Mr Barry MacDonald and lasts for three years from April 1973. It will take a number of curriculum development projects which ended in 1972 or 1973 and study them with a view to answering the following questions:

(a) To what extent do the new curricula appear to be meeting the aims of the developers and users?

(b) What is the nature and range of the influence they exert on educational practice?

(c) To what extent are the new curricula equipped to exploit sources of support and withstand forces of resistance?

(d) What are the main obstacles inhibiting the development, continuity and diffusion of the new curricula?

(e) What appear to be the strengths and weaknesses of each innovation, and to what extent can these be ascribed to strengths and weaknesses in the policies of each development team?

(f) What problems appear to be common to all the new curricula, and what conclusions can be drawn by comparing the effects of their differing responses to these problems?

Part II: RECOMMENDATIONS

Network

1. The working party believes strongly that the network of communications between projects and the Council on the one hand, and schools, teachers' centres, colleges of education, teachers' organizations and local education authorities on the other, needs further strengthening. The aim would be to facilitate a two-way flow of information and ideas largely on a personal basis and to improve the means of contact between projects and potential users of their curriculum development work. Steps are already being taken to identify liaison officers in ATOs and in colleges* and institutes of education. The Council, through its Joint Secretaries, should approach local education authorities to appoint liaison officers with a similar function and purpose, when the time is judged to be right.

2. Two additional Field Officers should be appointed, making twelve in all. It is important that Field Officers should not be regarded as 'selling agents' for individual projects. Nevertheless there are increasing demands on the Field Officer team to become involved with dissemination issues and to play a part in maintaining contact with the evolving network of liaison officers. An increase in number would also allow each Field Officer to develop closer relations with the colleges and institutes of education in their areas. The Field Officer's terms of reference should include the provision of feed-back to projects, particularly about relevant developments in non-trial areas.

Information Services

3. The Council should support the establishment of one area information centre as a pilot experiment in 1973/74 and concurrently prepare a discussion paper on the wider development of centres of different kinds. The working party would be given the responsibility for the preparation of the discussion paper.

4. The working party is convinced of the need for Dialogue to establish closer links with teachers. A revised format and the appointment of a reporter should be considered. The Editorial Board of the newsletter is also asked to examine the possibility of directing issues more closely at specified target audiences.

---

* See footnote to page 14.

5. The working party welcomes the decision to provide a conference exhibition comparable to the permanent exhibition in the Project Information Centre and to prepare display panels for a wider range of projects. The working party also approves of the new bulletin, Project News, which is issued bi-monthly, supplementing the annual Project Profiles and Index.

6. Information services expenditure and priorities should be looked at overall and not piecemeal. The working party recommends the establishment of a small informal committee, representative of the main Council committees, to provide the necessary guidance.

Training

7. The preparation of training materials, designed to meet the needs of schools, colleges of education and in-service training agencies is of central importance and should figure in the costing of all projects.

8. Immediate discussions should be held with the Council for Educational Technology, and with other bodies with experience in this field, to determine the organization and scope of the help which the Council might provide centrally for projects.

9. The working party recognizes the particular difficulty for project teams developing new teaching strategies of putting their ideas across to teachers not previously involved in the project. Such projects should consider preparing training material at each stage of the project's life, in order to demonstrate the development and modification of the project's approach. The material would be used in dissemination workshops and conferences, but also more widely in teachers' centres and colleges and institutes of education.

10. Project teams might also consider the organization of training courses for key personnel who would in turn be responsible for training others in their own localities.

11. Project teams should normally prepare materials specifically for use in colleges of education of such a kind that students can be made aware of the project and of its approach to its subject. The Schools Council/ATCDE/UCET Liaison Committee and the college liaison officers should be asked to advise on the nature of project material which would be of most help to colleges. There should also be liaison with the Council for Educational Technology over their Educational Technology in Teacher Education and Training Project (formerly known as CELPP).

12. Case studies of development work and other background material should be made available on request for use on training courses concerned with curriculum development.

13. Funds should be made available to assist projects which have ended, or are about to end, to prepare for teachers' centres audio-visual aids which would outline the project's aims and provide materials for discussion by local groups of teachers. The fund would be administered by the Council's Joint Secretaries. Other projects should be encouraged to exploit this technique as part of their dissemination strategy, meeting the cost from their own funds, or seeking extensions to cover it.

14. The Council should seek links with the proposed new regional training committees while maintaining existing contacts in the training field.*

15. Certain kinds of project involvement should be recognized as falling within the new arrangements for releasing teachers for in-service training.

Project Operation

16. New project directors should be given additional help in three ways:

(i) They should be invited to attend a short induction course at the Council when they would meet both experienced project directors and members of the Council's professional staff;

(ii) the Council's Handbook for Project Directors and Grant-holders, now being revised, should include a supplement covering advice on the preparation of technical aids, contact with the television and radio networks, the organization of conferences, the preparation of bulletins and newsletters and the indexing, storage and retrieval of materials.

(iii) a loan service of relevant project materials should be established.

Projects would be encouraged to meet together regularly on their own initiative for an exchange of ideas and a discussion of mutual problems.

17. Projects which use teachers in the preparation of material should seek to involve college of education staff. Colleges should normally be represented on Consultative Committees and be considered as the possible site of projects.

---

* The setting up of regional training committees is recommended in the White Paper, Education: a Framework for Expansion (HMSO, 1972), para.95.

18. The wider involvement of teachers in the preparation and discussion of materials and their trials is to be encouraged.

19. Information about the work and development of the project should be regularly available through the network which is being established.

20. The involvement of subject associations and teachers' associations with project activities should be fostered.

21. Projects tend to produce newsletters with a very general audience in mind and this is right in some circumstances. Projects should be reminded that occasionally they need to direct newsletters at specific target audiences, such as advisers, teachers' centre wardens or those primarily concerned with initial or in-service training.

22. The working party accepted evidence that an effective but little used method of dissemination is to invite advisers to spend a short time actually involved in the creative work of the project.

23. Projects should continue to make films, tapes, etc., especially where these can be applied in the dissemination of the project's ideas. Specialist help should be sought.

After-care

24. The Council should continue to provide after-care support for projects, mainly by providing information about their ideas and materials, the availability of training materials and the whereabouts of experienced teachers. This commitment is likely to grow pari passu with the increase in completed projects.

25. In principle there is no objection to certain bodies, such as colleges of education, undertaking the after-care of projects. When considering such proposals the Council would have to guard against extending the lives of obsolescent projects and appearing to create new orthodoxies.

26. The Council should take an early opportunity to discuss with the chairmen of education committees and chief education officers the arrangements made by local education authorities for supporting and sustaining curriculum innovation.

27. The working party would welcome the appointment of 'project teacher consultants' to facilitate the after-care of projects. Directors would be invited to identify teachers who had inside knowledge of the projects and were familiar with the problems of implementation in schools. Appointments would be subject to the

approval of the Council and the local education authorities concerned. The appointments might be either full-time or part-time, but in either case would be made for a period not normally exceeding a year in the first instance. The consultants would usually work in connection with one project on a regional basis. The first appointments would be regarded as an experiment and in the first instance would be confined to two full-time and two part-time consultants.

28. A fund should be established to enable teachers formerly associated with projects, project team members and Schools Council staff to participate more extensively in dissemination conferences organized by other bodies. This kind of commitment should be discussed with project staff, trial school teachers, etc., when they are appointed. The working party believes that it is particularly important in relation to the promotion of a project's publications. The fund would be operated at the discretion of the Council's Joint Secretaries.

29. It is the project team's responsibility to see that publishers' representatives are well informed about the project's aims and methods. It is also important that a list of teachers and schools experienced in the project's work is available for representatives to refer to when visiting other schools and teachers' centres.

Research and Evaluation

30. The working party considers that there would be advantage in attempting to evaluate the dissemination strategies adopted by selected projects. This evaluation would be undertaken independently of the project and separately funded. Studies might also be undertaken across projects and of aspects of dissemination not related to projects.

31. The working party would also welcome periodical assessments by the Council of the extent to which the ideas and materials of projects have been accepted in schools.

32. The promotion of research into school-based problems of project adoption is strongly supported.

33. Studies in dissemination not closely tied to projects might be undertaken by the Council or outside bodies in the usual way, but the working party strongly recommends the institution of Schools Council Research Fellowships for teachers in institutes of education or colleges of education, who might be well fitted for this work.

General

34. The working party recognizes that teachers' opinions are important in influencing the Council's choice of areas for research and development.

35. The Council should look for opportunities of funding curriculum development which arise from teachers' activities and ideas. In making these opportunities widely known the Council should look to local education authorities for encouragement and support.

36. Dissemination should be taken into account in the planning of a project and form part of the work of a project from a very early stage. This would have implications for the staffing and length of projects and might affect the number of new projects started.

37. Subject and steering committees should receive regular reports from projects and a final report when they have completed their work. Discussion with directors and evaluators should also take place on occasion.

38. Local and national radio and television can be of considerable benefit in disseminating new curriculum ideas but co-operation needs to be sought at an early stage if a project's materials are to contribute to the media's educational programmes.

39. Ways of including project material in Open University courses and of utilizing their communications facilities for dissemination should continue to be explored through the existing formal and informal links between the University and the Council.

40. A study should be made of the relevance and distinctive characteristics of different styles of curriculum development and in particular the relationship of national to local curriculum development work.

Appendix: Membership of the Working Party and List of Visitors

Members

Sir Lincoln Ralphs (Chairman)	Chief Education Officer, Norfolk
G. Askey	Warden, In-service Training Centre, Dyffryn House, Glamorgan
Mrs G. Box	Information Officer, Schools Council
J.R.K. Brown (until April 1973)	Field Officer, Schools Council, now Headmaster, Woldgate School, Pocklington, Yorks.
Miss H. Carter	Curriculum Officer, Schools Council
M. Davidson	Warden, Teachers' Centre, Southampton
W. Dempsey	Curriculum Development Officer, Teachers' Centre, Blackburn
Dr W. Hall	Joint Organizer, Schools Council Integrated Science Project
F. Jarvis	Deputy General Secretary, NUT and member of Programme Committee
P. Kaner	Director, Schools Council Mathematics for the Majority Continuation Project
Dr J. Kitching	Lecturer in Education, Durham University Institute of Education
G. Porter (until March 1973)	Curriculum Officer, Schools Council
D. E. Powell	Former Headmaster, Junior Mixed School, Treorchy, Rhondda; Chairman of Steering Committee A and member of Programme Committee
Miss S. D. Wood	Secretary, Association of Assistant Mistresses and member of Programme Committee
J.H. Thompson (Secretary) (until July 1973)	Curriculum Officer, Schools Council
R.E. Hebditch (Assistant secretary)	Schools Council

Observers

H.W. Bradley	Nottingham University School of Education
Mrs A.J. Dean	Chief Inspector, Surrey Local Education Authority
J. Jones	Open University
Miss M.I. Sandford	Inspector, Kent Local Education Authority

Council staff in attendance

A.J. Light	Joint Secretary
V.H. Stevens	Joint Secretary
Dr L.J. Stroud	Joint Secretary, formerly Educational Researcher
R. Sibson	Formerly Joint Secretary
I. McCulloch	Director of Information Services
W.G. Hamflett (until December 1972)	Co-ordinator of Field Officers
R. Hepburn (from January 1973)	Co-ordinator of Field Officers
P.S. Clift	Senior Educational Researcher
M. Plaskow	Media Adviser
W.M. Caldow	Finance Officer
S.D. Steadman	Educational Researcher
Miss J. Sturdy	Publishing Manager

Visitors

The following have either addressed the working party or taken part in its discussions by invitation. They are listed in order of their appearance.

Dr P. Kelly R. Nicodemus	Diffusion Research Project, Centre for Science Education, Chelsea College of Science and Technology, University of London
R. Cave	Chief Inspector, Cambridgeshire

Miss M. Woodward	Chief Inspector, Leeds
Dr L. Jesty	Chelsea College
C. Beresford	Teachers' Centre, Cambridge
D. Clegg	Teachers' Centre, Manchester
T. Priest	Teachers' Centre, Ilkeston
R. Spackman	Teachers' Centre, Wells
L. Williams	Teacher's Centre, Newtown
A. Becher	Nuffield Foundation
Dr M. Shipman	Evaluator, Schools Council Integrated Studies Project
F.J. Worsley	Director, Schools Council Project in Teaching English to West Indian Children
R. Yglesias	Longman
Miss M. Worrall	Oxford University Press
M. Lightfoot	Penguin Books
B. Bennett	Edward Arnold
H. MacGibbon	Heinemann
K. Bailey	BBC
P. Lewis	Independent Broadcasting Authority
M. Alderton	Thames Television
G. Manfield	Evaluator, Schools Council Mathematics for the Majority Continuation Project
G. Hubbard	Council for Educational Technology in the United Kingdom